

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**09-04-07
03:02 PM

September 4, 2007

Agenda ID # 6955
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 04-12-001

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Dian Grueneich. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to assigned Administrative Law Judge Karen Jones at kaj@cpuc.ca.gov and the assigned Commissioner. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE for
Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:avs

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER GRUENEICH**
(Mailed 9/4/2007)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Into
Implementation of Federal Communications
Commission Report and Order 04-87, As It
Affects the Universal Lifeline Telephone Service
Program.

Rulemaking 04-12-001
(Filed December 2, 2004)

**OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO NATIONAL CONSUMER LAW CENTER
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 07-05-030
AND DENYING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE**

This decision awards National Consumer Law Center (NCLC) \$29,085.00 in compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 07-05-030. This represents a decrease of \$1,520.00 from the amount requested due to an arithmetic error and a decrease in the hourly rates requested. This decision rejects The Greenlining Institute's (Greenlining) request for \$21,435.08 because Greenlining did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030, as required by Section 1802(i) of the Public Utilities Code.¹

This proceeding remains open to address long-term strategies to improve the California LifeLine certification and verification processes.

¹ All subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

1. Background

Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Article 8, LifeLine provides discounted residential wireline telephone service to eligible low-income Californians. Currently, carriers provide the discounted service to nearly 3.5 million Californians at a cost of \$304.5 million annually in federal fund, and \$251.35 million annually in state LifeLine funds.

In D.05-04-026, the Commission took the initial steps necessary to ensure that the state would continue to receive the annual federal Lifeline/Link-Up funds to protect the financial viability of the California LifeLine program. Specifically, that decision adopted a program of initial income certification and annual verification as required by the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC) Lifeline Order.²

The certification process is for new LifeLine customers. It requires potential new customers to provide proof of program eligibility by providing income documentation or by self-certifying participation in one of several approved assistance programs. The verification process occurs annually for existing LifeLine customers. This process requires current LifeLine customers to self-certify annually as to their continued eligibility either on an income basis or via participation in a recognized assistance program. The verification process requires customers to complete and return LifeLine forms to the certifying agent, self-certifying their eligibility.

In D.05-12-013 and in Resolution T-16996, the Commission adopted revisions to General Order (GO) 153 necessary to implement changes to the

² *Lifeline and Link-Up Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, WC Docket No. 03-109, FCC 04-87 (rel. April 29, 2004).

LifeLine program. The Telecommunications Division³ issued a Request for Proposal and entered into a contract with Solix, Inc. (Solix) to serve as third-party certifying agent for the certification and verification process. The Commission implemented the new certification/verification process on July 1, 2006.

Shortly after implementing the new program, Commission staff found that the customer response to the LifeLine verification notice was extremely low. In August 2006, 29% returned the verification notice, and, by the end of September, the percentage was only 49%. According to the telephone carriers that previously administered the LifeLine process prior to the federal changes, they experienced response rates of over 70%.⁴

On November 1, 2006, Commissioner Dian M. Grueneich issued an Assigned Commissioner's Ruling (ACR) temporarily suspending portions of GO 153 relating to the annual LifeLine verification process. The suspension, which was instituted for a period not to exceed six months, provided Commission staff an opportunity to identify the reasons for the low response rate and take steps to solve the problems.

The ACR also ordered Commission staff to hold a workshop including telephone carriers, Solix, and other interested parties to discuss solutions to the verification form response rate problem. The Commission ratified the November ACR in D.06-11-017 on November 9, 2006.

³ The Telecommunications Division is now known as the Communications Division.

⁴ The carrier response rates are not strictly comparable to current response rates since the program was administered differently at that time and only required that customers self-certify their income eligibility.

In compliance with D.06-11-017, staff convened workshops on November 13-14, 2006. Problems associated with the verification process were identified and two working groups, the Implementation Working Group and the Marketing Working Group, were established. The Implementation Working Group initially met on a weekly basis and now meets on a bi-weekly basis to discuss and find solutions to the low response rate for the verification process, while the Marketing Working Group meets regularly to develop marketing strategies and improve customer recognition of California LifeLine changes.

As a result of the November ACR, staff worked diligently with the carriers, Solix, and other interested parties to identify the reasons for the low response rates for certification and verification and to develop strategies to improve the processes.

On April 2, 2007, Commission staff completed work on a comprehensive study of the issues, "Report on Strategies to Improve the California LifeLine Certification and Verification Processes" (Staff Report). Many of the recommendations in the Staff Report result from the working groups established pursuant to D.06-11-017.

The Staff Report determined that both new customers applying for the LifeLine program and existing customers verifying their continued eligibility were being disqualified for reasons other than not meeting income or social service program requirements. Based on work with LifeLine customers, consumer groups, Solix, and carriers, staff identified a variety of problems contributing to the low LifeLine response rates and affecting customer enrollment in the program.

As the Staff Report explains, there is no single, simple solution to resolve the problems with the LifeLine program. Rather, a plethora of strategies,

short-and longer-term, must be pursued. In D.07-05-030, the Commission reviewed the Staff Report and used the recommendations in the Report to adopt modifications to GO 153 to improve the California LifeLine certification and verification processes. The decision also approved other strategies to improve the LifeLine process. The proceeding remains open to examine long-term strategies to improve the LifeLine certification and verification process.

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, which is set forth in Sections 1801-1812, requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if that party makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceedings. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

All of the following procedures and criteria must be satisfied for an intervenor to obtain a compensation award:

1. The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements including the filing of a sufficient notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference (PHC), pursuant to Rule 17.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), or at other appropriate time that we specify. (Section 1804(a).)
2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (Section 1802(b).)
3. The intervenor must file and serve a request for a compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision in a hearing or proceeding. (Section 1804(c).)
4. The intervenor must demonstrate "significant financial hardship." (Sections 1802(g) and 1804(b)(1).)

5. The intervenor's presentation must have made a "substantial contribution" to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor's contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision or as otherwise found by the Commission. (Sections 1802(i) and 1803(a).)
6. The claimed fees and costs must be reasonable (Section 1801), necessary for and related to the substantial contribution (D.98-04-059), comparable to the market rates paid to others with comparable training and experience (Section 1806), and productive (D.98-04-059).

In the discussion below, the procedural issues in Items 1-4 above are combined and a separate discussion of Items 5-6 follows.

3. Procedural Issues

Under Section 1804(a)(1) and Rule 17.1(a)(1), customers who intend to seek an award of intervenor compensation must file an NOI before certain dates. Since no PHC was held in this proceeding, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) established a deadline for the filing of NOIs. In a ruling dated January 11, 2005, the assigned ALJ set a deadline of February 14, 2005 for the filing of NOIs. NCLC timely filed its NOI on February 11, 2005 and Greenlining, on February 14, 2005.

In their NOIs, NCLC and Greenlining asserted financial hardship. On March 8, 2005, the ALJ ruled that Greenlining met the financial hardship condition pursuant to Section 1804(b)(1) through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility because the Commission found Greenlining met this requirement in another proceeding within one year of the commencement of this proceeding (ALJ Ruling dated February 24, 2004, in Rulemaking (R.) 03-09-006). Rule 17.2 states that a party found eligible in one phase of a proceeding remains eligible in later phases, including rehearing, in the same proceeding. In the March 8, 2005

ruling, the ALJ determined that NCLC would suffer significant financial hardship within the meaning of Section 1802(g), to pay the costs of effective participation in the proceeding.

Section 1802(b)(1) defines a “customer” as: (A) a participant representing consumers, customers or subscribers of a utility; (B) a representative who has been authorized by a customer; or (C) a representative of a group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential or small business customers. (Section 1802(b)(1)(A) through (C).) On March 8, 2005, the ALJ issued a ruling that found Greenlining and NCLC to be customers pursuant to Section 1802(b)(1)(C).

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, NCLC filed its request for compensation on July 2, 2007, and Greenlining filed on July 6, 2007. Both requests were filed within 60 days of D.07-05-030 being issued, in compliance with the requirements of Rule 17.3. No party opposed the requests.

4. Substantial Contribution

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we look at several things. First, whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer. (Section 1802(i).) Second, if the customer’s contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, whether the customer’s participation unnecessarily duplicated or materially supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the presentation of the other party or to the development of a fuller record that assisted the Commission in making its decision. (Sections 1801.3(f) and 1802.5.)

As described in Section 1802(i), the assessment of whether the customer made a substantial contribution requires the exercise of judgment.

In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.⁵

Should the Commission not adopt any of the customer's recommendations, compensation may be awarded if, in the judgment of the Commission, the customer's participation substantially contributed to the decision or order. For example, if a customer provided a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record, the Commission could find that the customer made a substantial contribution. With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions NCLC and Greenlining made to the proceeding.

NCLC alleges that it was very involved in this phase of the proceeding, participating in meetings and working group conference calls, and made a substantial contribution on many issues adopted in D.07-05-030. In the working groups, NCLC has been supportive of efforts to increase the number of LifeLine consumer "touches" to help promote the new LifeLine program and to help consumers work their way through the new forms and processes. D.07-05-030 provides for additional reminders and notices to customers (Conclusion of Law 6, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 1) and carrier correspondence to existing customers to coincide with relaunch of the new verification process (OP 6).

⁵ D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC 2d 628 at 653.

NCLC expressed concern about the inadequacies of the certifying agent's use of standard mail as opposed to first class mail. NCLC asked that the Commission continue with the suspension until the verification problems were fixed, but it also strongly supported AT&T's proposal that the Commission conduct a 10% sample test once the verification process was resumed. In D.07-05-030, the Commission ordered the Communications Division to take the steps necessary to implement first class mail for all aspects of LifeLine as quickly as possible (OP 5) and lifted the suspension of the verification process for a 20% random sample of customers, to be gradually increased to 100% upon review of the results (OP 12). Also, NCLC was supportive of the staff's proposed expansion of the verification and certification timelines through the modification of GO 153. The Commission adopted the proposed expanded timeline. (OP 1.)

NCLC advocated gathering information on whether carriers are backbilling large amounts under the expanded timeline and to address this issue in the second phase of the proceeding. NCLC also advocated the use of reasonable payment plans should consumers have problems with large backbills due to the expanded timeline. The Commission adopted NCLC's recommendation to address the backbilling issue in Phase 2 of the proceeding. The Commission, while not ordering carriers to allow customers to pay the backbilled amounts over three months, strongly encouraged them to work with customers on special payment arrangement on a case-by-case basis. (D.07-05-030 at 13.)

NCLC also advocated for the timely development of the web-based system as a tool for LifeLine consumers, and the Commission required staff to monitor the process of implementation of the web-based system to ensure that Solix

completes its development work in the time period established in D.05-12-013 (OP 15).

Our review of the record shows that NCLC achieved a high level of success on the issues it raised. In the areas where we did not adopt NCLC's position in its entirety, we benefited from NCLC's analysis and discussion of all of the issues which it raised. The Commission has awarded full compensation even where the intervenor's positions were not adopted in full, especially in proceedings with a broad scope. (D.98-04-028, 79 CPUC 2d 570, 573-74.)

We find that NCLC made a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030.

Greenlining alleges that it was actively engaged throughout the proceeding by: 1) filing opening and reply comments; 2) engaging in extensive research; 3) participating in proceeding workshops; 4) providing testimony to the Commission; and 5) conducting market studies. Greenlining asserts that it made substantial contributions to the proceeding in that Greenlining was one of the only parties to push for modernization of the LifeLine program, as well as addressing the needs of those the LifeLine program was intended to help, namely, low-income and minority communities. According to Greenlining, without its intervention in the proceeding, these issues would not have been addressed in other parties' comments.

Greenlining states that it was one of the only parties to raise the following four issues: self-certification, backbilling, geographical differences in low-income and minority communities and how that affects a ratepayer's ability to qualify for LifeLine, as well as bringing Lifeline into the 21st century by applying LifeLine to cell phones.

We find that Greenlining's request for compensation does not comply with Rule 17.4(a) which states:

The request for compensation shall identify each issue resolved by the Commission for which the intervenor claims compensation, and shall specify the pages, findings, conclusions and/or ordering paragraphs in the Commission decision which resolve the issue.

Since Greenlining's request does not include that information, we have carefully reviewed the record to analyze the four issues raised by Greenlining and their disposition in D.07-05-030.

The first issue Greenlining raises is self-certification. The issue of self-certification was addressed by the Commission in D.05-04-026. In that phase of the proceeding, Greenlining proposed that the Commission retain the current system of self-certification,⁶ but the Commission rejected that proposal stating:

While LIF [Latino Issues Forum]/Greenlining's proposal to retain the current system of self-certification is admirable, such a proposal would put over \$300 million of federal funding in jeopardy. As demonstrated above, the FCC specifically eliminates self-certification as an acceptable method of certification so Greenlining's proposal to seek a one-year extension to fashion a study to determine the impact of replacing the current self-certification process with an income documentation requirement will not help us to meet the FCC's requirement.⁷

In other words, the issue of self-certification was evaluated and rejected by the Commission previously in this proceeding. That issue was not addressed in D.07-05-030, and Greenlining's attempt to revisit the issue in this phase of the proceeding does not constitute a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030.

⁶ Under a system of self-certification, program participants could "self-certify" that they met the income requirements of the LifeLine program and would not have to provide documentation to support that they were eligible for LifeLine.

⁷ D.05-04-026 at 9.

The second issue Greenlining raises is that of backbilling. The decision does address that issue on pages 11-13. However, Greenlining's comments do not add to the record. After summarizing the backbilling problem, Greenlining presents its solution as follows:

Therefore, if for no other reason than the potential for low-income consumers to receive "backbills" of more than \$100 dollars from carriers, Greenlining urges the Commission to return to a self-certification process.⁸

In other words, Greenlining's only proposal for the backbilling issue is to return to a self-certification process. As stated above, the issue of self-certification was disposed of earlier in this proceeding, and Greenlining's proposal regarding backbilling was strictly in the context of reinstating the self-certification process. Therefore, we find that Greenlining's comments on backbilling did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030.

The third issue raised by Greenlining in its compensation request was geographical differences in the cost of living and how that affects ratepayers' ability to qualify for LifeLine. After careful review of D.07-05-030, we find this issue was not addressed in D.07-05-030.

The fourth issue raised by Greenlining is that of bringing LifeLine into the 21st century by applying LifeLine to cell phones. After reviewing the decision, we find that this issue is not addressed in D.07-05-030. In fact, in an ALJ Ruling dated June 11, 2007, the assigned ALJ found that Greenlining's proposal to transform the LifeLine program to one based on cell phones to be outside the scope of the proceeding. The ruling states:

⁸ Reply Comments of the Greenlining Institute on Proposed Decision of ALJ Jones, April 30, 2007 at 9.

From the very beginning the Commission has stressed that the scope of this proceeding is narrow and focused. In the Preliminary Scoping Memo that appears as part of the original Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) that initiated this proceeding, the Commission states: “This OIR focuses primarily on the narrow issue of revising our income eligibility criteria to conform to the Lifeline/Link-Up Order in order to preserve the federal funding.”⁹ The purpose of this proceeding is not to undertake a complete overhaul of the LifeLine program. As such, the comments of SureWest and the Small LECs are justified. Greenlining’s proposal is outside the clearly-established scope of this proceeding and will not be considered as part of this proceeding.¹⁰

Section 1802(i) states in evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, the Commission must determine whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations. We find that Greenlining did not meet that requirement since three of the four issues Greenlining presented in support of its request for compensation were not addressed in the decision, and the Commission did not adopt Greenlining’s proposal on the backbilling issue. Therefore, we find Greenlining did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030 in any respect and is not eligible for a compensation award.

4.1. Contributions of Other Parties

Section 1801.3(f) requires an intervenor to avoid participation that unnecessarily duplicates that of similar interests otherwise adequately represented by another party, or participation unnecessary for a fair

⁹ *Order Instituting Rulemaking into Implementation of Federal Communications Commission Report and Order 04-87, As It Affects The Universal Lifeline Telephone Service Program*, R.04-12-001 at 6.

determination of the proceeding. Section 1802.5, however, allows an intervenor to be eligible for full compensation if its participation materially supplements, complements, or contributes to that of another party if that participation makes a substantial contribution to the Commission order.

NCLC alleges that it contributed to the proceeding in a manner that did not duplicate contributions made by other intervenors. NCLC collaborated closely with other consumer groups to avoid duplication wherever possible, and NCLC filed jointly with The Utility Reform Network (TURN), Latino Issues Forum (LIF), and Disability Rights Advocates in every instance. In many instances, due to the limited resources of the other consumer groups, NCLC has been the lead consumer group on the Implementation and Marketing Working Group calls and has shared developments from those conference calls with the other Joint Consumers. We concur that NCLC has attempted to avoid duplication by filing as part of a group of consumers with similar interests.

Once we have determined the scope of a customer's substantial contribution, we then look at whether the compensation request is reasonable.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

NCLC requests \$30,605 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

Attorney	Year	Hours	Rate or 1/2 Rate	= \$ Total
Olivia Wein	2006	31.75	\$275	= \$ 8,731.25
Olivia Wein	2006	9	\$137.5 (1/2 rate)	= \$ 1,237.50
Olivia Wein	2007	63	\$275	= \$17,325.00
Olivia Wein	2007	22.5	\$137.5 (1/2 rate)	= \$ 3,093.75

¹⁰ ALJ Ruling at 2-3.

Charles Harak	2006	0.5	\$435	= \$ 217.50
Total Hours		126.75	Total amount	= \$30,605.00

In general, the components of this request must constitute reasonable fees and costs of the customer's preparation for and participation in a proceeding that resulted in a substantial contribution. The issues we consider to determine reasonableness are discussed below.

5.1. Hours and Costs Related to and Necessary for Substantial Contribution

We first assess whether the hours claimed for the customer's efforts that resulted in substantial contributions to Commission decisions are reasonable by determining to what degree the hours and costs are related to the work performed and necessary for the substantial contribution.

NCLC documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its attorneys, accompanied by a brief description of each activity. The hourly breakdown reasonably supports the claim for total hours.

5.2. Intervenor Hourly Rates

We next take into consideration whether the claimed fees and costs are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

NCLC seeks an hourly rate of \$275 for Olivia Wein for work performed in 2006 and 2007. However, we previously approved a rate for Wein of \$255 for work done in 2006 in D.06-04-021 and adopt the same rate here. For 2007, consistent with the guidance provided in D.07-01-009, we adopt an hourly rate of \$265 for Wein, which represents an increase of 3% over the 2006 rate, rounded to the nearest \$5.

NCLC seeks an hourly rate of \$435 for Charles Harak for work performed in 2006. We previously approved this rate for Charles Harak in D.06-11-009 and adopt it here.

Greenlining requested \$21,435.08 for its participation. Since we found that Greenlining did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030, we will not further review Greenlining's request for compensation.

5.3. Productivity

D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. The costs of a customer's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through its participation. This showing assists us in determining the overall reasonableness of the request.

NCLC notes that the Commission stated in the Bill of Rights proceeding: "[I]t is often the case that regulations that protect public health, safety and welfare impose significant costs on the regulated industry that can be estimated, even if imprecisely, while providing benefits that cannot easily be reduced to dollar terms."¹¹ According to NCLC, the benefits realized through its participation in this proceeding are hard to quantify in dollar terms because the ultimate benefits to consumers, while unquestionably large, are hard to quantify. NCLC notes that this proceeding is of vital importance to the 3.4 million current California LifeLine customers who will be undergoing the new LifeLine verification process and that the California LifeLine program provides over \$300 million in federal support and over \$250 million in state LifeLine support to

¹¹ D.04-12-001 at 138, *quoting Reply of NCLC, TURN, UCAN and CU to Wireless Industry Motion for Leave to File Economic Analysis*, at 8-9.

low-income Californians to make basic phone service affordable. According to NCLC, in this case the benefits of NCLC's participation clearly outweigh the costs.

We agree that the functioning of the LifeLine verification system has a significant impact on the 3.4 million Californians that participate in the program. We also agree that this program, which has been improved through NCLC's participation, has social benefits which, though hard to quantify, are substantial. Thus, we find that NCLC's efforts have been productive.

5.4. Direct Expenses

NCLC included travel costs as part of its claim for staff hours. The hours for travel are clearly marked and are billed at ½ the hourly rate. The cost breakdown included with the request shows the travel expenses to be appropriately handled. We find these costs reasonable.

6. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award NCLC \$29,085. In addition to the adjustments to the hourly rate described above, we shifted the December 2006 hours to 2006; NCLC had included them in the count of 2007 hours.

Attorney	Year	Hours	Rate or ½ Rate	= \$ Total
Olivia Wein	2006	37	\$255	= \$9,435.00
Olivia Wein	2006	9	\$127.5 (1/2 rate)	= \$1,147.50
Olivia Wein	2007	57.75	\$265	= \$15,303.75
Olivia Wein	2007	22.5	\$132.5 (1/2 rate)	= \$2,981.25
Charles Harak	2006	0.5	\$435	= \$217.50
Total Hours		126.75	Total amount	= \$29,085.00

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we order that interest be paid on the award amount (at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial

paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15) commencing on September 15, 2007, the 75th day after NCLC filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

This rulemaking proceeding affected a broad array of utilities field. As such, we find it appropriate to authorize payment of today's awards from the Commission's intervenor compensation program fund, as described in D.00-01-020.

We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. NCLC's records should identify specific issues for which it requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed.

7. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the Commissioner in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

Dian M. Grueneich is the assigned Commissioner, and Karen A. Jones is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. NCLC and Greenlining have satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. NCLC made a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030 as described herein.

3. Greenlining did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030.
4. NCLC requested hourly rates for its representatives that, as adjusted herein, are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.
5. NCLC requested related travel expenses that are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
6. The total of the reasonable compensation for NCLC is \$29,085.00.
7. Greenlining is not eligible for compensation since it did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-05-030.
8. The appendix to this opinion summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. NCLC has fulfilled the requirements of Sections 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled to intervenor compensation for its claimed compensation , as adjusted herein, incurred in making substantial contributions to D.07-05-030.
2. NCLC should be awarded \$29,085 for its contribution to D.07-05-030.
3. Greenlining has not fulfilled the requirements of § 1801(i), which governs whether a consumer has made a substantial contribution to a decision and is not entitled to intervenor compensation.
4. This order should be effective today so that NCLC may be compensated without further delay.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. National Consumer Law Center (NCLC) is awarded \$29,085.00 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 07-05-030.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, NCLC's award shall be paid from the intervenor compensation program fund, as described in

D.00-01-020. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning September 15, 2007, the 75th day after the filing date of NCLC's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?
Contribution Decision(s):	D0705030	
Proceeding(s):	R0412001	
Author:	Commissioner Grueneich	
Payer(s):	Commission	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Greenlining Institute	7-6-2007	\$21,435.08	0	No	Failure to make substantial contribution
National Consumer Law Center	7-2-2007	\$30,605.00	\$29,085.00	No	Failure to justify hourly rate; arithmetic errors

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Olivia	Wein	Attorney	National Consumer Law Center	\$275	2006	\$255
Olivia	Wein	Attorney	National Consumer Law Center	\$275	2007	\$265
Charles	Harak	Attorney	National Consumer Law Center	\$435	2006	\$435
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$505	2006	--
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$520	2007	--
Thalia	Gonzalez	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$195	2006	--
Thalia	Gonzalez	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$215	2007	--

(END OF APPENDIX A)

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated September 4, 2007, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ANTONINA V. SWANSEN
Antonina V. Swansen

***** PARTIES *****

**Last Updated on 17-JUL-2007 by: JVG
R0412001 NOPOST**

Josephine Wong
APEX TELECOM INC.
PO BOX 1917
OAKLAND CA 94604

Gregory L. Castle
Senior Counsel
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, RM. 2022
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 778-1487
gregory.castle@att.com

James Young
General Attorney & Assist. General Coun
AT&T CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1904
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 778-1420
james.young@att.com

Greta Banks
DORETTA DEA
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA
525 MARKET STREET, 18TH FLOOR, 4
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 778-1271
greta.banks@att.com

Agnes Ng
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
525 MARKET ST 20TH FLOOR 4
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 442-2143
For: AT&T

Katy Lindsay
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
525 MARKET ST. 19TH FLOOR ABIDE 4
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 442-2938
klindsay@att.com

Ronald W. Delsesto Jr.
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW, SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5116
(202) 424-7500
rwdelsesto@swidlaw.com
For: Vonage Holdings Corp.

William B. Wilhelm, Jr.
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5166
(202) 424-7500
wbwilhelm@swidlaw.com
For: Vonage Holdings Corp.

Brian Plackis Cheng
BLUE CASA COMMUNICATIONS
911 OLIVE STREET
SANTA BARBARA CA 93101
finance@bluecasa.com

Linda Burton
DEBBIE BEHIE
PO BOX 219
OAKHURST CA 93644
(559) 642-0229
lindab@stcg.net

Joleen Hogan
LORRIE BERNSTEIN
CAL-ORE TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 847
DORRIS CA 96023
joleen@cot.net

Yvonne Smythe
CALAVERAS TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 37
COPPEROPOLIS CA 95228
(209) 785-2211
ysmythe@caltel.com

Richard Charbran
C/O Community Partners
CALIF. COMMUNITY TECH. POLICY GROUP
606 SOUTH OLIVE ST., SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES CA 90014
(909) 234-1768
chabran@cctpg.org

Lesla Lehtonen
Vp Legal And Regulatory Affairs
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOM ASSOCIATION
360 22ND STREET, SUITE 750
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 628-8043 X-107
ll@calcable.org
For: CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS
ASSOCIATION

Nikayla K. Nail Thomas
Executive Director
CALTEL
515 S. FLOWER STREET, 47/F
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 213-3740
nnail@caltel.org

Cindy Manheim
Senior Regulatory Coounsel
CINGULAR WIRELESS
PO BOX 97061
REDMOND WA 98073-9761
(425) 580-8112
cindy.manheim@cingular.com

Deborah R. Scott
Associate General Counsel
CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS
PO BOX 340
EL GROVE CA 95759
(916) 691-5550
drscott@czn.com

Laura Patric Furciniti
KIM KRETCHMER
CITIZENS TELECOMS. CO. OF CA.
180 S. CLINTON AVENUE
ROCHESTER NY 14646-0300

Laura Patric Furciniti
CITIZENS TELECOMS. CO. OF GS
180 S. CLINTON AVENUE
ROCHESTER NY 14646-0400

Laura Patric Furciniti
KIM KRETCHMER
CITIZENS TELECOMS. CO. OF TU/CA/GS
180 S. CLINTON AVENUE
ROCHESTER NY 14646-0400

Lisa Moglia
COMCAST
WEST TOWER
1500 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA PA 19102

Jeffrey F. Beck
JILLISA BRONFMAN
Attorney At Law
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, L.L.P.
201 CALIFORNIA ST., 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 433-1900
smalllecs@cwclaw.com
For: Evans/GTE West Coast/Happy
Valley/Hornitos/Kerman/Pinnacles/Siskiyou/Volcano/Winter

E. Garth Black
Attorney At Law
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 433-1900
gblack@cwclaw.com

Patrick M. Rosvall
Attorney At Law
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 433-1900
smalllecs@cwclaw.com
For: Roseville/Calaveras/CA-
ORE/Ducor/Foresthill/Ponderosa/Sierra Telephone

Jose Jimenez
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, L.L.C.
2200 POWELL STREET, SUITE 1035
EMERYVILLE CA 94608
(510) 923-6220
Jose.Jimenez@Cox.com
For: COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC

Douglas Garrett
Vice President, Western Region Regulator
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC, DBA COX COMM
2200 POWELL STREET, SUITE 1035
EMERYVILLE CA 94608-2618
(510) 923-6220
douglas.garrett@cox.com

Donnell Rustich
COX COMMUNICATIONS
2200 POWELL STREET, SUITE 1035
EMERYVILLE CA 94608

Suzanne Toller
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533
(415) 276-6500
suzannetoller@dwt.com

Shelley Bergum
DEAF & DISABLED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRGRM
505 14TH STREET, SUITE 400
OAKLAND CA 94612-3532
(510) 302-1100
sbergum@ddtp.org

haven Teleph

Richard A. Elbrecht
Attorney At Law
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
400 R STREET, SUITE 3090
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-6200
(916) 445-5126
Richard_Elbrecht@dca.ca.gov

Craig Walker
President And Ceo
DIALPAD COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
430 N. MCCARTHY BLVD., SUITE 200
MILPITAS CA 95035
(408) 635-1001
craig@dialpad.com
For: DIALPAD COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Daniel W. Douglass
JAMES U. TROUP
Attorney At Law
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
(818) 961-3001
douglass@energyattorney.com
For: CHOCTAW COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Amy Topper
EZ PHONE, INC.
PO BOX 4656
AKRON OH 44310
amy@ezphoneusa.com

W. Lee Biddle
Attorney At Law
FERRIS & BRITTON
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1600
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 233-3131
lbiddle@ferrisbritton.com
For: Cox California Telecom, LLC

W. Lee Biddle
Attorney At Law
FERRIS & BRITTON, P.C.
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1600
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 233-3131
lbiddle@ferrisbritton.com
For: FERRIS & BRITTON, A.P.C.

Paul Rebey
FOCAL COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
200 N LA SALLE STREET, STE. 1100
CHICAGO CA 60601
prebey@focal.com

Bettina B Cardona
FONES4ALL
6320 CANAGA AVE., SUITE 600
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
bettina@fones4all.com

Edward J Schneider, Jr
FORESTHILL TELEPHONE CO., INC.
4655 QUAIL LAKES DR.
STOCKTON CA 95207
ejs@ejschneider.com

Charles E. Born
Manager-State Government Affairs
FRONTIER, A CITIZENS TELECOMMUNICATIONS
PO BOX 340
ELK GROVE CA 95759
(916) 686-3570
cborn@czn.com

Ralph L. Dimatteo
GLOBAL CROSSING
180 SOUTH CLINTON AVE.
ROCHESTER NY 14646

Linda Cooper
GLOBAL VALLEY NETWORKS, INC.
515 KEYSTONE BLVD.
PATTERSON CA 95363-8861
(209) 394-4000
carlar@gvni.net

Michael B. Day
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
mday@goodinmacbride.com
For: Cellular Carriers Association of California (CCAC)

Elizabeth Andrion
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
eandrion@gmsr.com

Christy C. Kunin
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
SUITE 300
1625 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20036
(202) 238-7700
ckunin@graycary.com

Larry Blosser
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
1625 MASSACHUSETTS, N.W., STE. 300
WASHINGTON DC 20036
lblosser@graycary.com

Gail Long
Telephone Company
HAPPY VALLEY/HORNITOS/WINTERHAVEN
PO BOX 1566
OREGON OR 97045
gail.long@tdstelecom.com

Erin Dawley
HORNITOS TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 5158
MADISON WI 53705-0158

Scott Beer
Director & Counsel
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
9800 PYRAMID CT STE 250
ENGLEWOOD CO 80112-2666
scott_beer@icgcomm.com

Dave Clark
GLENDA KOUNTZ
KERNAN TELEPHONE COMPANY
811 S MADERA AVE.
KERNAN CA 93630
dclark@kermantelephone.com

Enrique Gallardo
LATINO ISSUES FORUM
160 PINE STREET, SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 547-7550
enriqueg@lif.org

Richard Severy
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
201 SPEAR STREET, 9TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 228-1121
richard.b.severy@mci.com
For: MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

Patrick Chow
NIKAYLA K. NAIL
Sr. Manager-Regulatory Compliance/ Atty
MCI NETWORK SERVICES, INC.
201 SPEAR STREET, 9TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 228-1129

David Moriarty
MEDIA ONE/ AT&T BROADBAND
550 CONTINENTAL BLVD.
EL SEGUNDO CA 90245

Lisa I. Moglia
GRETA L. BANKS
MEDIAONE TELECOMMUNICATIONS OF CA
795 FOLSOM STREET, RM 2160E
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107

Lorrie Bernstein
MOSS ADAMS LLP
3121 WEST MARCH LANE, STE. 100
STOCKTON CA 95219-2303
lorrie.bernstein@mossadams.com

Jeanine Poltronieri
Dir. Of Teleco Strategy & Regulation
MOTOROLA INC.
1350 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3305
(202) 371-6896
J.Poltronieri@motorola.com

Robert J. Gloistein
The Orrick Building
ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
405 HOWARD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-2669
(415) 773-5700
rgloistein@orrick.com

Lynne Martin
PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.
1776 MARCH LANE, SUITE 250
STOCKTON CA 95207
lmartin@pacwest.com

Peter A. Casciato
Attorney At Law
PETER A. CASCIATO, A PROF. CORP.
355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107
(415) 291-8661
pcasciato@sbcglobal.net

Lorrie Bernstein
PINNACLES TELEPHONE COMPANY
340 LIVE OAK ROAD
PAICINES CA 95043-9998

PUBLIC ADVOCATES, INC.
131 STEUART STREET, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 431-7430
rmarcantonio@publicadvocates.org
For: PUBLIC ADVOCATES, INC.

Mark Fogelman
REED SMITH LLP
SUITE 2000
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 543-8700
mfogelman@reedsmith.com

Karl Andrew
Regulatory Affairs
SAGE TELECOM, INC.
805 CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY SO, STE 100
ALLEN TX 75013-2789

Robert B. Ryan
SBC
140 NEW MONTGOMERY, ROOM 1909
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

Mary E. Dejong
SBC CALIFORNIA
140 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, ROOM 708
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 542-1272
maryliz.dejong@sbc.com

Keith Epstein
SBC-IPCS, INC.
1010 N SAINT MARYS STREET, ROOM 14Q
SAN ANTONIO TX 21024
(210) 246-8600
keith.epstein@sbc.com

Peter Glass
STEVE BEATTY
SEREN INNOVATIONS, INC.
15 SOUTH 5TH STREET, STE 500
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402
Peter.M.Glass@xcelenergy.com

John D. Zorn
Manager
SPRINT COPMMUNICATIONS CO. L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
OVERLAND PARK KS 66251-6100

Stephen H. Kukta
Counsel
SPRINT NEXTEL
201 MISSION STREET, SUITE 1400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 572-8358
stephen.h.kukta@sprint.com

Robin Bernhard
LINDA LUPTON
SUREWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 969
ROSEVILLE CA 95678

Sean Wilson
TALK.COM
12020 SUNRISE VALLEY, STE.250
RESTON VA 20191

Derek Khlopin
Director, Law & Public Policy
TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
2500 WILSON BLVD., SUITE 300
ARLINGTON CA 22201
(703) 907-7739
dkhlopin@tiaonline.org
For: TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

Jeff Compton
TELSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS, INC
606 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE
MONROVIA CA 91016

Thalia N.C. Gonzalez
Attorney At Law
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4002
thaliag@greenlining.org
For: The Greenlining Institute

Dan Douglas
MINDY DUALLL
THE PONDEROSA TELEPHONE CO.
PO BOX 21
O'NEALS CA 93645
dand@ponderosatel.com

James Lowers
DENISE REYNOLDS
THE SISKIYOU TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 157
ETNA CA 96027
jtlowers@sisqtel.net

Christine Mailloux
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
cmailloux@turn.org
For: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

Regina Costa
Research Director
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 X312
rcosta@turn.org

William R. Nusbaum
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 X 309
bnusbaum@turn.org

Rose Cullen
THE VOLCANO TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 1070
PINE GROVE CA 95665-1070

Darreb R. Stroud
TIME WARNER CONNECT
303 W. PALM AVENUE
ORANGE CA 92866

Mary Pharo
VAR TEC TELECOM, INC.
1600 VICEROY DRIVE
DALLAS TX 75235

Elaine M. Duncan
Attorney At Law
VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 474-0468

Eugene M. Eng
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.
CA501LS
112 LAKEVIEW CANYON ROAD
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362
(805) 372-7350
eugene.eng@verizon.com

Karen Bailey
Verizon West Coast
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.
HQE01G69
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DR., E01E55
IRVING TX 75038-2092
(972) 718-5295
k.bailey@verizon.com

Lupita Reyes
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.
MAIL CODE HQE02F69
600 HIDDEN RIDGE
IRVING TX 75038
(972) 718-6744
lupita.reyes@verizon.com
For: VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.

Alan Mason
VERIZON SERVICES ORGANIZATION, INC.
HQE01E61
600 HIDDEN RIDGE
IRVING TX 75038
(972) 718-8082
alan.mason@verizon.com

Sara A. Lauer
VERIZON WEST COAST INC.
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DR., E01E55
IRVING TX 75038-2090

Thalia R. Gietzen
VYCERA COMMUNICATION, INC.
12750 HIGH BLUFF DR., STE.200
SAN DIEGO CA 92130-2565

Peter D. Shields, Esq.
WILEY REIN & FIELDING LLP
1776 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20006
(202) 719-7000
pshields@wrf.com

elaine.duncan@verizon.com
For: VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.

Chris Byrnes
WINTERHAVEN TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 5158
MADISON WI 53705-0158

Carl W. Wood
Executive Division
RM. 5200
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2440
cxw@cpuc.ca.gov
For: LIOB

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Daphne Rhoe
Dgs-Telecommunications Division
CALIFORNIA 9-1-1 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION
601 SEQUOIA PACIFIC BLVD.
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 657-9911
daphne.rhoe@dgs.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA 9-1-1 EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION

Henry Knowls
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY & SENIOR SERVICES
3175 WEST 6TH STREET RM 200
LOS ANGELES CA 90020
(213) 738-2644
hknowls@co.la.ca.us

Robert Lehman
CPUC - OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
leh@cpuc.ca.gov

Karen Jones
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 2106
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-1483
kaj@cpuc.ca.gov

Lance Wenger
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR SCHWARZENEGGER
444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW
HALL OF THE STATES, SUITE 134
WASHINGTON DC 20001

Terrie D. Prosper
Executive Division
RM. 5301
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2160
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov

Angela Young
Information & Management Services Divisi
AREA 3-B
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2837
ayy@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ULTS Trust

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Mark J. Angell
ANGELL & ASSOCIATES
1075 ROSEWOOD DRIVE
GRAPEVINE TX 76051
(817) 329-7424
For: DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS

Eric A. Artman
PO BOX 471
TIBURON CA 94920
(415) 717-9726
eric.artman@comcast.net

Kathleen Greenan
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET N.W., STE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5116
(202) 424-7500

Richard M. Rindler
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, N.W., STE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007
(202) 424-7500
r.rindler@bingham.com

Tamar E. Finn
MICHAEL P. DONAHUE
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
3000 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5116
(202) 424-7500
tefinn@swidlaw.com

(202) 624-5270
lwenger@wdc.ca.gov
For: OFFICE OF GOVERNOR SCHWARZENEGGER

Donald Jackson
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
MIC-61
PO BOX 942879
SACRAMENTO CA 94279-0061
(916) 323-6910
Don.Jackson@boe.ca.gov

Mike Borsetti
2200 GREEN ST.
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123-4710
(415) 928-5695
mike@borsetti.com

Steve Bowen
BOWEN LAW GROUP
235 MONTGOMERY ST., SUITE 920
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
steve.bowen@bowenlawgroup.com

Camille A. Estes
BOWEN LAW GROUP, LLP
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 920
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 394-7500
camille.estes@bowenlawgroup.com

Glenn Semow
CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMM. ASSOC.
360 22ND STREET, STE. 750
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 628-8043
grs@calcable.org
For: CALIFORNIA CABLE & TELECOMM. ASSOC.

Andrew Ulmer
Staff Counsel
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, SUITE 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-2226
aulmer@water.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER ASSN.

Nikayla Nail Thomas
Executive Director
CALTEL
515 S. FLOWER STREET, 47/F
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 213-3740
nmail@caltel.org

George Granger
V.P. External Affairs
CINGULAR WIRELESS
4420 ROSEWOOD DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR
PLEASANTON CA 94588
(925) 227-3070
george.granger@cingular.com

CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS
4 TRIAD CENTER, SUITE 200
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84180
(469) 365-3528
astevens@czn.com

Margarita Gutierrez
Deputy City Attorney
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 375
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 554-4632
margarita.gutierrez@sfgov.org
For: OFFICE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CITY ATTORNEY

Fran David
CITY OF BERKELEY
3RD FLOOR
280 MILVIA STREET
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 981-7300
fdavid@ci.berkeley.ca.us

Mike Wilson
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
3700 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 310
LOS ANGELES CA 90010
(213) 368-7178
mwilson@finance.lacity.org

Terrance Manocchio
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
201 N MAIN ST., RM 101
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
(213) 978-1516
tmanocchio@finance.lacity.org

Heidi L. Sieck
Telecommunications & Policy Advisor
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPT. OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS & INFO SERV
875 STEVENSON, 5TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103

For: CALTEL

heidi.sieck@sfgov.org

Roger Pickler
CITY OF SAN JOSE
ROOM 217
801 N. FIRST STREET RM. 227
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 277-5876
Rogerpickler@sanjoseca.gov

Kimberly Hall Barlow
Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF WHITTER
JONES & MAYER
3777 N. HARBOR BLVD.
FULLERTON CA 92835
(714) 446-1400
khb@jones-mayer.com

John Gutierrez
Director Of Government Affairs
COMCAST PHONE OF CALIFORNIA LLC
12647 ALCOSTA BLVD., SUITE 200
SAN RAMON CA 94583
(925) 973-7214
john_gutierrez@cable.comcast.com

Mark P. Schreiber
Attorney At Law
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 433-1900
mschreiber@cwclaw.com
For: SUREWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY

Katherine K. Mudge
Senior Counsel
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY
7000 NORTH MOPAC EXPRESSWAY, 2D FL
AUSTIN TX 78731
(512) 514-6381
katherine.mudge@covad.com

Phil Ceguera
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY
110 RIO ROBLES
SAN JOSE CA 95134
(408) 952-6484
pceguera@covad.com

Esther Northrup

Esther Northrup
COX COMMUNICATIONS
5159 FEDERAL BLVD.
SAN DIEGO CA 92105
(619) 266-5315
esther.northrup@cox.com

Process Supervisor
2 Copies
CPUC
(HANDCARRY TO CHIEF ALJ)

Suzanne Toller
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533
(415) 276-6500
suzannetoller@dwt.com
For: DAVID WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

Maria Juarez
Riverside County
DEPT OF COMMUNITY ACTION
2038 IOWA AVE., SUITE B-102
RIVERSIDE CA 92507
(909) 955-3563
mjuarez@riversidedpss.org
For: LIOB

Timothy M. Dayonot
DEPT. OF COMMUNITY SVCS AND DEV.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
700 NORTH 10TH STREET ROOM 258
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-0338
(916) 322-2940
tdayonot@csd.ca.gov
For: LIOB

Gregory T. Diamond
7901 LOWRY BLVD.
DENVER CO 80230
(720) 670-2018
gdiamond@covad.com

Ortensia Lopez
Executive Director
EL CONCILIO OF SAN MATEO
1419 BURLINGAME AVE., SUITE N
BURLINGAME CA 94010

Attorney At Law
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC
5159 FEDERAL BLVD.
SAN DIEGO CA 92105
(858) 244-4910
esther.northrup@cox.com

(650) 373-1087
or10sia@aol.com
For: LIOB

Charles L. Best
Vice President And General Counsel
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC.
4400 NE 77TH AVENUE
VANCOUVER WA 98662
(360) 816-3000
cbest@eli.net

Anita Taff-Rice
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF ANITA TAFF-RICE
1547 PALOS VERDES MALL, NO. 298
WALNUT CREEK CA 94597
(415) 699-7885
anitataffrice@earthlink.net

Janine L. Scancarelli
Attorney At Law
FOLGER, LEVIN & KAHN, LLP
275 BATTERY STREET, 23RD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 986-2800
jscancarelli@flk.com
For: LIOB

Earl Nicholas Selby
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF EARL NICHOLAS SELBY
418 FLORENCE STREET
PALO ALTO CA 94301-1705
(650) 323-0990
ens@loens.com
For: NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Paul White
Assistant Executive Director
FRESNO COUNTY ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES COM
5476 W. BEDFORD
FRESNO CA 93722
(559) 263-1025
paul.white@fresnoeoc.org
For: LIOB

Greg Rogers
Director State Regulatory Affairs
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
1025 ELDORADO BLVD.
BROOMFIELD CO 80021
(720) 888-2512
greg.rogers@level3.com
For: LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS

John Clark
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, 9TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 765-8443
jclark@goodinmacbride.com
For: Fones4All

Gary Tucker
Attorney
LEVEL S COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
1025 EL DORADO BLVD
BROOMFIELD CO 80021
(720) 888-2529
gary.tucker@level3.com

Cynthia Walker
Dir. Of Governmental & External Affairs
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
620 3RD ST
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107-1902
(510) 239-7089
cheryl_hills@icgcomm.com

Katherine Mckenney
LIGB
5854 GREENRIDGE ROAD
CASTRO VALLEY CA 94552
(510) 238-7575
kmckenney@oaklandnet.com

Cindy Clugy
Director Regulatory Affairs
INTRADO INC.
6503 BRITTANY PARK
HOUSTON TX 77066

Karen Lindh
LINDH & ASSOCIATES
7909 WALERGA ROAD, STE 112/119
ANTELOPE CA 95843
(916) 729-1562
karen@lindhandassociates.com

(281) 866-9911
cindyc@intrado.com

Donald E. Lively
3412 MCELLEN CT.
LAFAYETTE CA 94549
(925) 283-6418
donllive@pacbell.net

Carol A. Shaw
Deputy City Attorney
LONG BEACH CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
333 W. OCEAN BLVD., 11TH FLOOR
LONG BEACH CA 90802-4664
(562) 570-2224
carol_shaw@longbeach.gov

Donald H. Maynor, Esq.
235 CATALPA DRIVE
ATHERTON CA 94027
(650) 327-2894
don@uutlaw.com

Ann Flemer
Deputy Director, Operations
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
101 8TH STREET
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 464-7801

Jim Macrae
Joseph P. Bort Metrocenter
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
101 8TH STREET
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 817-3214
jmacrae@mtc.ca.gov
For: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mary E. Wand
Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 268-7000
mwand@mofo.com

Joseph Meyers
Executive Director
NATIONAL INDIAN JUSTICE CENTER
5250 AERO DRIVE
SANTA ROSA CA 95403
For: INDIAN

Garnet Goins
Government Affairs Department
NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Jose E. Guzman, Jr.
Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 398-3600
jguzman@nossaman.com
For: NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT LLP

Martin A. Mattes
Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799
(415) 398-3600
mmattes@nossaman.com
For: NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP

Jason P. Talley
Ceo
NUVIO CORPORATION
9233 WARD PARKWAY
KANSAS CITY MO 64114
(816) 444-4422
jason@nuvio.com

Noah K. Wood, Esq.
Director
NUVIO CORPORATION
9233 WARD PARKWAY
KANSAS CITY MO 64114
(816) 444-4422
noah@nuvio.com

Ssa Martin J. King
Federal Bureau Of Investigation
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
SUITE 300
14800 CONFERENCE CENTER DRIVE
CHANTILLY VA 20151
mking@askcalea.net
For: FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Lon Goldstein
T-Mobile
OMNIPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2330 BISSO LANE, SUITE 100
CONCORD CA 94520

2001 EDMUND HALLEY DRIVE
RESTON VA 20091
(703) 433-4248
garnet.goins@nextel.com
For: NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

lon.Goldstein@t-mobile.com

Alan Woo
Director Of Planning&Program Development
ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
12640 KNOTT STREET
GARDEN GROVE CA 92841
(714) 897-6670
awoo@capoc.org
For: LIOB

Jeff Wirtzfeld
Regulatory Contact
QWEST COMMUNICATION CORPORATION
1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 4700
DENVER CO 80202
(303) 896-5959
jeff.wirtzfeld@qwest.com

Josh P. Thieriot
PAC-WEST TELECOMM
1776 W. MARCH LANE, SUITE 250
STOCKTON CA 95207
(209) 926-3615
jthierio@pacwest.com
For: PAC-WEST TELECOMM

Kristin L. Smith
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, 10TH FLOOR
DENVER CO 80202
(303) 383-6614
Kristin.Smith@qwest.com

Ethan Sprague
PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.
1776 W. MARCH LANE, SUITE 250
STOCKTON CA 95207
(209) 926-3416
esprague@pacwest.com

Scott J. Rafferty
4730 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20016
(202) 380-5525
rafferty@gmail.com

Nancy Griffin
Regulatory Compliance
PAC-WEST TELECOMM. INC.
1776 W. MARCH LANE, SUITE 250
STOCKTON CA 95207
(209) 926-3403
ngriffin@pacwest.com
For: PAC-WEST TELECOMM INC.

Kahl Joseph
RCN TELECOM SERVICES, INC
105 CARNEGIE CENTER, 2ND FLOOR
PRINCETON NJ 08540
(610) 438-0119
joseph.kahl@rcn.net

Linda L. Agerter
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LAW DEPARTMENT, B30A
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-6623
LLA3@pge.com

Joseph Kahl
Director Regulatory Affairs
RCN TELECOM SERVICES, INC.
196 VAN BUREN ST STE 300
HERNDON VA 20170-5337
(610) 438-0119
joseph.kahl@rcn.net

Stephen Goodman
Cfo
PREPAID TEL. COM. INC.
409 CENTER STREET
YUBA CITY CA 95991
(530) 822-0326 400

Trudy Longnecker
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
RCN TELECOM SERVICES, INC.
105 CARNEGIE CENTER
PRINCETON NJ 08540
(609) 734-4533
trudy.longnecker@rcn.net

Ron Garcia
RELIABLE ENERGY MANAGEMENT, INC.
6250 PARAMOUNT BLVD.

sgoodman@primecompanies.com
For: PREPAID TEL. COM. INC.

LONG BEACH CA 90805
(562) 984-5511
ron@reenergy.com
For: LIOB

Taura O'Lariscy
Project Manager
RHA
1225 8TH ST., SUITE 580
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-9828
taura@rhainc.com

Douglas Klein
SAIC C/O FBI CALEA IMPLEMENTATION UNIT
SUITE 300
14800 CONFERENCE CENTER DRIVE
CHANTILLY VI 20151
dklein@askcalea.net
For: SAIC C/O FBI CALEA IMPLEMENTATION UNIT

Yolanda Whiting
Director Of Consumer Programs & Services
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
8335 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 654-1274
ywhiting@sdge.com
For: LIOB

Darren S. Weingard
Senior Counsel
SBC
140 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, ROOM 1520
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 542-7706
darren.weingard@sbc.com

Margee Moore
Regulatory Affairs Department
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017
(619) 696-4323

Peter M. Glass
Vice President & General Counsel
SEREN INNOVATIONS, INC.
15 SO. 5TH STREET, SUITE 500
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402
(612) 215-4604

Earl W. Comstock
Counsel For Earthlink, Inc.
SHER & BLACKWELL LLP
1850 M STREET NW, SUITE 900
WASHINGTON DC 20036
(202) 463-2514
ecomstock@sherblackwell.com
For: SHER & BLACKWELL LLP

David A. Simpson
Attorney At Law
SIMPSON PARTNERS LLP
900 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 773-1790
david@simpsonpartners.com
For: NET2PHONE, INC.; NET2PHONE GLOBAL SERVICES
LLC; NET2PHONE CABLE TELEPHONY, LLC.

Thomas K. Braun
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO.
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE., 1, RM 360
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(818) 302-4413
thomas.k.braun@sce.com

Glenn Stover
Attorney At Law
STOVER LAW
221 MAIN STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-1906
(415) 495-7000
glenn@stoverlaw.net

Gail Long
Manager, External Relations
TDS TELECOM
PO BOX 1566
OREGON CITY OR 97045-0566
(503) 656-8399

Jim Hawley
California Director And General Counsel
TECHNOLOGY NETWORK
2600 EAST BAYSHORE ROAD, 1ST FLOOR
PALO ALTO CA 94303

Bruce D. Jacobs
GLENN S. RICHARDS
SHAW PITTMAN LLP
2300 N STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20037-1128
(202) 663-8000
bruce.jacobs@shawpittman.com

(650) 213-1160
jhawley@technet.org
For: TECHNOLOGY NETWORK

Stephanie Chen
Legal Associate
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY STREET, 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4011
stephaniec@greenlining.org

Kent Lassman
Research Fellow
THE PROGRESS & FREEDOM FOUNDATION
5 W. HARGETT STREET NO. 305
RALEIGH NC 27601
(919) 754-9902
klassman@pff.org

David M. Wilson
Attorney At Law
WILSON & BLOOMFIELD LLP
1901 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1630
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 625-8250
dmw@wblaw.net

Matthew Freedman
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
freedman@turn.org
For: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

Leon M. Bloomfield
Attorney At Law
WILSON & BLOOMFIELD, LLP
1901 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1620
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 625-1164
lmb@wblaw.net

Michel Peter Florio
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
mflorio@turn.org
For: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

Walter McGee
WORKING ASSETS FUNDING SERVICE
101 MARKET STREET NO 700
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 369-2053
wmcgee@wafs.com

Margaret L. Tobias
TOBIAS LAW OFFICE
460 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107
(415) 641-7833
info@tobiaslo.com

Lee Biddle
Attorney At Law
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
3100 - 5TH AVENUE, SUITE B
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 696-6966
lbiddle@ucan.org

Michael Shames
Attorney At Law
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK

3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 696-6966
mshames@ucan.org

Donna O'Brien
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.
112 LAKEVIEW CANYON, CA501LS
THOUSAND OAKS CA 91362
(805) 372-7626
donna.obrien@verizon.com